(8)

IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION NO ...../2006 SINGLE BENCH

PETITIONER : Dashrath Lal Kodaku S/o Late Shri Suru Ram aged about 54 years presently wroking as permanent Gangman (P.W.D.) R/o Village -Birnipali, Teh. Sarangarh, Distt. Raigarh (C.G.)

P.R. No. 2326/06 Presented by Shri Sameer Bhatt 1/5/06

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :

1. State of Chhattisgarh through its Secretary, Public Works Department, Mantralaya, D.K.S. Bhavan, Raipur (C.G.)

RECEIVED-COPY 1/5/06 CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

2. Engineer-in-Chief, Public Works Department, Near 'Raj Bhawan', Distt. Raipur (C.G.)

3. Superintedning Engineer, Public Works Department, Bilaspur Division, Distt. Bilaspur (C.G.)

4. Executive Engineer, Public Works Department, Distt- Raigarh (C.G.)

5. Sub Divisional Officer, Public Works Department, Tahsil-Sarangarh, Distt-Raigarh (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, PROHIBITION, CERTIORARI ETC. OR ANY OTHER DIRECTION OR ORDER TO DO JUSTICE IN THE MATTER

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH : BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE SHRI SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.

WRIT PETITION NO. 2295 OF 2006

Petitioner : Dashrath Lal Kodaku

versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

Present : Shri Sameer Behar, counsel for the petitioner.
Shri A.S. Kachhawaha, Government Advocate for the respondents/State.

ORAL ORDER

(4th May, 2006)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was employed as Gangman in the year 1978 in the office of the Public Works Department, Tahsil Sarangarh, District Raigarh. It is not clear as to whether the petitioner was appointed pursuant to open invitation of the applications and by selection amongst the similarly situated persons.

2. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has worked for more than 25 years of service. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the Madhya Pradesh Gangman Service Rule 1996 come into force from 1.1.1996 and as per Rule, the petitioner is entitled to regularization.

3. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner may be allowed to make a representation before the concerned authorities to consider his case, in accordance with the provisions of law, to which learned counsel appearing for the respondents has no objection.

4. The petition is accordingly disposed of with the above liberty to make a representation, if any. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K.Agnihotri
Judge

Bablu